

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

THOMAS HILL, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

BUILDER SERVICES GROUP, INC., a foreign
corporation, BRIAN BUNCH and JANE DOE
BUNCH and the marital community comprised
thereof,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-1478-JCC

MINUTE ORDER

The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C. Coughenour, United States District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' letter submissions (Dkt. Nos. 20, 21). On Friday, November 13, 2020, counsel for Defendants emailed the Court asking for a telephonic hearing under Local Civil Rule 7(i). Because it appeared the parties had not yet met and conferred in good faith to resolve the issue without Court intervention, the Court ordered the parties to do so and instructed that if the parties were unable to resolve the dispute and agreed that expedited consideration was appropriate, they could file letter briefs setting forth the parties' positions on Monday, November 16, 2020.

On Monday, November 16, 2020, Defendants filed a letter brief arguing that an email

1 communication sent by Plaintiff's counsel to Defendant Brian Bunch and to other employees of
2 Defendant Builder Services Group, Inc. violated RPC 4.2, RPC 7.3, and raised corporate
3 attorney-client privilege issues. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 20.) Defendants ask the Court to
4 disqualify Plaintiff's counsel or, in the alternative, to prohibit Plaintiff from using any
5 information or documents received in response to the communication. (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff argues
6 that the issue is not appropriate for consideration on expedited letter briefs, that expedited
7 consideration without full briefing will prejudice Plaintiff, and that Defendants' letter brief was
8 improperly filed because the parties had not agreed to seek expedited consideration of the matter.
9 (*See generally* Dkt. No. 21.)

10 Having fully considered the parties' briefing and the relevant record, the Court finds that
11 consideration of the matter on an expedited basis is not warranted. The Court will benefit from
12 fuller briefing, and based on the reported status of the dispute and the type of relief requested by
13 Defendants, no unique urgency or specific prejudice will result if the parties address the matter
14 by filing motions in the ordinary course. Accordingly, the Defendants' request for a telephonic
15 hearing or a ruling on the letter briefs is DENIED without prejudice.

16 DATED this 17th day of November 2020.

17 William M. McCool
18 Clerk of Court

19 s/Paula McNabb
20 Deputy Clerk